

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/824,625	04/02/2001	Albert S. Lee	22727-66	8907	
21125 75	590 05/31/2002				
NUTTER MC	CLENNEN & FISH	LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			SCHOPFER, KENNETH G		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3739		
			DATE MAILED: 05/31/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A1				
	Application N .	Applicant(s)				
	09/824,625	LEE ET AL.				
Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenneth G Schopfer	3739				
The MAILING DATE f this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 A</u>	April 2001 .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.	,				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	aminer.	}				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		1				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		1				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	;				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applic	eation No				
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(e) (to a provisional application).				
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)	priority and 01 00 0.0.0. 33					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Inform	nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3739

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-19, drawn to an apparatus for thermally affecting tissue, classified in class 607, subclass 113.
 - II. Claims 20-28, drawn to another apparatus for thermally affecting tissue, classified in class 607, subclass 113.
 - III. Claims 29-33, drawn to a method of thermally affecting tissue, classified in class607, subclass 113.
 - IV. Claim 34, drawn to a method of cooling brain tissue, classified in class 607, subclass 113.
 - V. Claims 35-40, drawn to another method of cooling brain tissue, classified in class607, subclass 113.
 - VI. Claims 41-43, drawn to an apparatus for cooling brain tissue, classified in class 607, subclass 113.
 - VII. Claim 44, drawn to a method of thermally affecting cranial tissue, classified in class 607, subclass 113.
 - VIII. Claim 45, drawn to a method of cooling brain tissue, classified in class 607, subclass 113.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 3739

- 2. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as being capable of use together and they have different modes of operation. Invention I cools tissue by contact with the outer surface of a device through which coolant fluid flows, while invention II cools fluid by directly deploying a coolant fluid onto a region of tissue.
- 3. Inventions III and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process can be practiced by another apparatus such as a device including fluid-tight coils and configured to circulate fluid throughout the fluid-tight coils.
- 4. Inventions IV, V, VIII and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to practice another process such as the cooling of tissue in other areas of the body including the urethra during prostate ablation procedures.
- 5. Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different

Art Unit: 3739

inventions are not discloses as being capable of use together and they have different modes of operation. Invention VI is configured for cooling of brain tissue while invention I may be used to cooled other areas of the body including the urethra during prostate ablation procedures.

- 6. Inventions VII and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice a different process such as the cooling of tissue in other areas of the body including the urethra during prostate ablation procedures.
- 7. Inventions IV, V, and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as being capable of use together and they inherently have different modes of operation because they are method claims comprising different steps.
- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for any of groups I-VIII is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: a first species seen in figures 1, 2, 4, and 6-8, a second species seen in figure 3, a third species seen in figures 9-11, a fourth species seen in figures 12-14, a fifth species seen in figure 15, and a sixth species seen in figures 16A and 16B.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 3739

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth G Schopfer whose telephone number is 703-305-2649. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 703-308-0994. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

KŚ

May 28, 2002

LINDA C. M. DVORAK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER GROUP 3700